



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

men they personally knew to be "competent" for service and "good and true." The question of the defendant's constitutional right under the Fourteenth Amendment was not raised in the principal case, but it often is where similar facts are involved. See 17 HARV. L. REV. 351.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS — GOVERNMENTAL POWERS AND FUNCTIONS — RIGHT TO AMUSE CITIZENS. — An ordinance passed by the municipal council of the city of Toledo ordered a transfer of one thousand dollars to the department of public service for the establishment of a municipal moving-picture theatre. The city auditor refusing to make the transfer, a proceeding in mandamus was brought against him. *Held*, that the writ of mandamus be denied. *State ex rel. City of Toledo v. Lynch*, 102 N. E. 670 (Oh.). See NOTES, p. 162.

OFFER AND ACCEPTANCE — REWARD — UNILATERAL CONTRACTS. — A reward is offered for the arrest and conviction of a criminal. A. gives information that leads the authorities to B. and C. who identify the criminal. He is arrested and confesses. The offeree pays the money into court and files a bill of interpleader. *Held*, that the reward be equitably divided between A., B., and C. *Bloomfield v. Maloney et al.*, 20 Detroit Leg. N. 700 (Sup. Ct., Mich., July 18, 1913).

An offer of a reward is an offer to a unilateral contract, to be accepted by performance. It follows that the general principles of the law of contracts apply, and that this performance must comply with the terms of the offer. *Williams v. West Chicago St. R. R. Co.*, 191 Ill. 610. Performance of only part of what is asked for, cannot entitle one to any part of the reward. *Furman v. Parke*, 21 N. J. L. 310; *Hogan v. Stophlet*, 179 Ill. 150, 63 N. E. 604. Similarly if the result asked for has been accomplished, but by the efforts of several people acting independently, each of whom performs only a part, no one of them can claim to have fulfilled the conditions of the offer, and consequently the reward has not been earned. If, however, these people had coöperated in a partnership, the reward would fairly be earned by that partnership for distribution among its members. *Kinn v. First Nat. Bank of Mineral Point*, 118 Wis. 537, 95 N. W. 969. Although is not absolutely clear from the report of the principal case, it seems that the claimants acted independently, and if this view of the facts is correct the case cannot be supported.

POST-OFFICE — WHETHER GOVERNMENT CAN SUE AS BAILEE OF OWNER FOR CONVERSION OF MAIL — EFFECT OF OWNER'S FRAUD. — The defendant was under contract to carry for the plaintiff (the United States) such foreign and domestic mail as was delivered to it in accordance with the acts of Congress and the regulations of the Post-Office Department. A package of jewelry having a salable value, which was mailed in France and addressed to Havana, via the United States, was lost owing to the defendant's negligence. The postal convention between the plaintiff and the French Republic prohibits the transmission by mail into the United States of any merchandise having a salable value. The Postmaster-General imposed a fine upon the defendant, in accordance with the statute providing such a penalty for delinquencies in the mail service, but the amount of the fine was not determined by the value of the lost articles. Act June 8, 1872, c. 335, § 266, 17 STAT. AT LARGE, 316. This action for the value of the jewelry is brought by the United States as bailee of the owner. *Held*, that the plaintiff cannot recover. *United States v. Atlantic Coast Line R. Co.*, 206 Fed. 190 (Dist. Ct., E. D. N. C.).

Where a railroad carries mails for the government its liability to the government depends upon the special contract between it and the government. *Atchi-*